Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 28 1995
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

(1)

95 678

No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term 1995

In re **JOHN LUCILLE,**

Petitioner,

v.

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. BAUER *and*
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Respondents.

Corrected Petition For Writ of Mandamus
Pendete Lite To The
United States Court of Appeals For The Seventh Circuit.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

John Lucille, *Pro se*
2741 W. Warren Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60612
(312) 826-6518

Questions Presented For Review

I. Whether or not Petitioner is entitled to evidence of, and access to, tape recordings of court proceedings in the possession of court personnel, which would tend to show and prove, fraud upon the court, in the form of altered transcripts, fraudulent judgments and fraud in process under the common law.

II. Whether or not Petitioner is entitled to "back-up" tapes held by court clerks, court reporters/stenographers, or other court personnel which would tend to prove fraud upon the court in his *Shakman* case in the lower United States District Court.

III. Whether or not a United States Court of Appeals is required to order "back-up" tapes of court proceedings to be produced where a litigant demands a complete record under the common law, and is able to show that court transcripts, court dockets and court orders have been fraudulently and unlawfully altered to the damage, prejudice and detriment of the petitioner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Questions Presented For Review	i.
Table of Contents	ii.
Table of Authorities	iii.
Jurisdictional Statement	1.
Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved	2.
Statement of the Case	4.
Reasons for Granting the Writ	5.
Conclusion	8.

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix A	Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, No. 95-2109, The Honorable William J. Bauer, presiding, (Issued August 28, 1995)	9.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Page

Allen v. City of Chicago, 92 C 4122 (N.D.Ill.1992) 6
Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.,
322 U. S. 238, 88 L.Ed. 1250, 64 S.Ct. 997 (1944) 6
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (Cranch) 137 (1803)..... 1
McClellan v. Carland, 217 U.S. 268, 30 S.Ct. 501,
54 L.Ed. 762 5
People v. English, M., 189 Ill.App.3d 392,
136 Ill.Dec. 795, 545 N.E.2d 319 (Ill.1989) 5
Rockdale Management Co. v. Shamut, N.A.,
418 Mass. 596, 638 N.E.2d 29 (Mass. 1994) 6
Skelly Oil v. Universal Oil, 338 Ill.App.79,
86 N.E.2d 875 (Ill.1949) 5
Wzorek v. City of Chicago, 84 C 9978 (N.D.Ill.1984) ... 7

Constitutional Provisions

U.S. Const. 6
U.S.C. Title 28, Section 1254(1) 1
Ill. Const. 6

Other Sources

	Page
The 1599 Geneva Bible, Herbert 248 (1599)	5
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Operating Procedures (Jan. 1, 1989)	5

Jurisdictional Statement

Petitioner appeals pursuant to the Common Law and this Court's inherent powers to exercise jurisdiction under the United States Constitution to the ends of justice by means of the extraordinary writ of mandamus as set forth in *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (Cranch) 137 (1803), and its progeny. Statutory jurisdiction is 28 U.S.C. s. 1254(1)

Petitioner appeals a judgment entered in Case No. 95-2109, *John Lucille v. City of Chicago*, the Honorable William J. Bauer, Circuit Judge presiding, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, dated August 28, 1995, a copy of which is included in Appendix A.

Exceptional circumstances exist which warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers in aid of the Court's jurisdiction including, the need in our society to restore the foundations upon which the righteous may execute justice, i.e., a judicial branch which stands for truth, a judiciary which abhors fraud upon the courts, and a judicial system which provides access to the courts for redress of grievances caused by unlawful court process to avoid vigilanteism and breakdowns in our society.

Petitioner is unable to receive relief in any form or from any other court because he has already heard from the former Chief Judge of the highest authority in his Circuit. There is no higher earthly authority to which Petitioner may appeal his demands for a complete record in order to fully prosecute his case of alleged fraud upon the court.

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

ARTICLE I. SECTION 2 to the Illinois Constitution

No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law nor be denied the equal protection of the laws.

AMENDMENT XIV Sect. 1 to the United States Constitution

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

28 U.S.C. Section 1254(1)

Cases in the courts of appeals may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by the following methods:

(1) By writ of certiorari granted upon the petition of any party to any civil or criminal case, before or after rendition of judgment or decree;

Constitutional and Statutory Provisions Involved

Illinois Supreme Court Rule 321

The record on appeal shall consist of the judgment appealed from, the notice of appeal, and the entire original common law record, unless the parties stipulate for, or the trial court, after notice and hearing, or the reviewing court, orders less. The common law record includes every document filed and judgment and order entered in the cause and any documentary exhibits offered and filed by any party. Upon motion the reviewing court may order that other exhibits be included in the record. The record on appeal shall also include any report of proceedings prepared in accordance with Rule 323. There is no distinction between the common law record and the report of proceedings for the purpose of determining what is properly before the reviewing court.

Statement of the Case

Pro se petitioner appeals an order of the Seventh Circuit denying his Common Law Writ of Mandamus seeking the production of "back-up" tapes of court personnel which would show that court transcripts, court dockets and court orders have been unlawfully altered to the damage of petitioner and others similarly situated.

Petitioner has a constitutional right to seek redress of grievances with the judicial branch and is entitled to meaningful open access to courts through "back-up" tapes for a true common law appellate record. Said "back-up" tapes are the best evidence to show fraudulent court reporter signatures, altered and deleted testimony, and fraud upon the court, which includes, a former attorney, not of record, unlawfully causing judgment to be entered on behalf of petitioner without his consent, and deleted statements of corporation counsel for the City of Chicago which would show that petitioner is entitled to more employee benefits than he has received. Another attorney for petitioner, Gordon James Arnett, mysteriously died just prior to seeking the release of these very tapes.

Some federal courts of the Seventh Circuit apparently believe they are "above the law" in not complying with Freedom of Information Act requests and reasonable demands from interested parties. This Court should take some steps to ensure that truth is upheld in the federal courts and that routine and reasonable access to truth is not denied a litigant.

Reasons For Granting The Writ

This Writ should be heard and granted to set an example and to send a message to all Circuits. Fraud upon the courts will not be tolerated by the highest Court in the land. For the foundations are cast downe, what hath the righteous done? *Psalm* XI:iii, *The 1599 Geneva Bible*, Herbert 248 (1599).

This Court may issue a Writ of Mandamus in the aid of appellate jurisdiction that might otherwise be defeated by the unauthorized action of the court below. *McClellan v. Carland*, 217 U.S. 268, 30 S.Ct. 501, 54 L.Ed. 762. The common law record imports verity and is presumed correct, but where other facts appear contrary to the record, the court should consider the record as a whole. *People v. English, M.*, 189 Ill.App. 3d 392, 136 Ill.Dec. 795, 545 N.E.2d 319 (1 Dist. 1989)

A Motion to Listen to Tapes of oral arguments under supervision of the clerk's office is deemed "routine" under the operating procedures of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, *U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Operating Procedures* (Jan. 1, 1989), and Lucille has received tapes from the court in the past. Under Illinois state law, the common law record includes every document filed, and judgment and order entered in the cause and any documentary exhibits offered and filed by any party. Ill.Sup. Ct.Rule 321. In addition, there is no distinction between the common law record and the report of proceedings for the purpose of determining what is properly before the court. Ill.Sup.Ct.Rule 321.

Fraud perpetrated by court personnel reaches to the very heart of our judicial system. *Skelly Oil v. Universal Oil*, 338 Ill.App. 79, 86 N.E.2d 875 (1st App.Dist. 1949), *Rockdale Management Co. v. Shamut Bank, N.A.* 418 Mass. 596, 638 N.E.2d 29 (Mass. 1994), *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238, 88 L.Ed. 1250, 64 S.Ct. 997 (1944). The type of frauds perpetrated in Lucille's *Shakman* case are not exclusive to his appeal. In 1984, the Executive Committee for the U.S. District Court entered an order in Shakman, 69 C 2145 (1984), that no Shakman petitions would be assigned to the calendar of Judge Marvin E. Aspen, an ex-City of Chicago corporation counsel. Even so, Judge Aspen is being assigned and hearing *Shakman* cases in the City of Chicago by the Northern District of Illinois. See *Allen v. City of Chicago*, 92 C 4122 (N.D.Ill. 1992). Seventh Circuit Judge Bauer is not indicating that the tapes Lucille demands do not exist or are unavailable. The judge has merely indicated that Lucille may not have them for any purpose, even where fraud is apparent and alleged. Lucille is entitled to a complete court record on appeal under the due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitutions of the State of Illinois and the United States of America. Lucille has been afforded no hearing or opportunity to be heard by the federal District and Appellate Courts in Illinois on the subject of the fraud alleged. U.S. Const., Amend. 14, Ill. Const. Art. I, Sec. 2. As U.S. District Court Judge Brian Barnett Duff stated in *Wzorek v. City of Chicago*, 84 C 9978, another *Shakman* case in 1992, concerning the court reporter's tapes to petitioner's now deceased attorney Gordon Arnett:

"...if you could get them, then everybody in the world could get them, and we would be playing them every night on Channel 7, Channel 5, on Channel 2, and Channel 9 and Channel 6 and Channel 32 whenever they wanted them."

Wzorek v. City of Chicago, 84 C 9978, Motion Hearing, July 23, 1992. This is what some judges truly fear. What they really fear is the public exposure and condemnation of the frauds being perpetrated upon litigants behind closed doors, where no cameras are permitted. The problem is that fraud condoned at the top is spread out through the whole system, and this is why people in society begin to take the law into their own hands. The results are Oklahoma City, Waco, Ruby Ridge, etc., where officials in authority begin to believe that they can do anything they desire without repercussion. The record is clear in Lucille's case that the court reporter's transcripts are incomplete where the corporation counsel for the City of Chicago discusses benefit entitlements as they relate to John Lucille. Therefore, Lucille requests, then demands repeatedly the "back-up" tapes which would set the record straight on the issues. The Courts, however, balk at the notion. First the District Court, now the Appellate Court, and the record remains incomplete. John Lucille is entitled to discover and present the truth in Court. What are the Courts afraid of? Fraud. People going to jail, people losing

their jobs, disbarments, impeachments, removals from office for good cause. The question is, will the highest Court in the land close its eyes and ears? Will this court do what is right? They encourage themselves in a wicked purpose: They commune together to lay snares privily and say, Who shall see them? Psalm 64:5, *The 1599 Geneva Bible*, Herbert 248 (1599). Will this Court open its doors and eyes for an African-American from the sewer department in the City of Chicago to investigate or oversee the fraud alleged? Even the President had to hand over his private taped recordings, are the courts above the law? If there's nothing to hide, why the failure to produce? Wherefore, pro se petitioner respectfully requests that this Court oversee his request to produce by way of Writ of Mandamus requiring the Seventh Circuit Appellate Court to issue the proper orders to provide the necessary tapes for petitioner's appeal therein. God is, in the name of Jesus.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, and in the honor of Attorney Gordon Arnett of Chicago, who had his life taken over this issue, an extraordinary Writ of Mandamus should issue to review the judgment and opinion of the Court of Appeals in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: Sept. 26, 1995

John Lucille PRO SE

John Lucille, pro se.

United States Court of Appeals *do*

For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

August 28, 1995

Before

Hon. WILLIAM J. BAUER, *Circuit Judge*

JOHN LUCILLE,	] Appeal from the United
Plaintiff-Appellant,	] States District Court for
	] the Northern District of
No. 95-2109 v.	] Illinois, Eastern
	] Division.
CITY OF CHICAGO, an	]
Illinois Municipal Corporation	] No. 85 C 5956
Defendant-Appellee.	] John A. Nordberg,
	] Judge.
	]

Upon consideration of the **MOTION FOR COMPLETE RECORD (COMMON LAW WRIT OF MANDAMUS)** filed August 17, 1995, by pro se appellant,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion is **DENIED.**

APPENDIX A

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
95 678 SEP 28 1995
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No.

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term 1995

In re **JOHN LUCILLE,**

Petitioner,

v.

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM J. BAUER *and*
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Respondents.

Corrected Petition For Writ of Mandamus *Pendete Lite* To The United States Court of Appeals For The Seventh Circuit.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

John Lucille, *Pro se*
2741 W. Warren Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60612
(312) 826-6518

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

	Page
Statement of the Supplemental Appendix	i.
Civil Docket Sheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) p. 7	ii.
Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) December 4, 1989, ...	iii.
Final Judgment Order, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985)	iv.
Civil Docket Sheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) p. 8	v.
Plaintiff's Preliminary Reply to Petition to Enforce Settlement Agreement, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985)	vi.
Plaintiff's Notice to Strike and Dismiss - Motion In Limine, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985)	vii.

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX (cont.)

Plaintiff's Certified Affidavit re: Death of Arnett, Gordon James, of Chicago, Illinois, U.S. Supreme Court Bar Member (9/9/93) ..... viii.

Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) January 11, 1990, ... ix.

Minute Order of 4/27/95, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) the Honorable John A. Nordberg, presiding ..... x.

Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Wzorek, Eugene v. City of Chicago* 84 C 9978 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) July 23, 1992, ... xi.

Civil Docket Sheet, *Wzorek, Eugene v. City of Chicago* 84 C 9978 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) p. 15 , line 207 ..... xii.

General Order, *Shakman v. The Democratic Organization of Cook County*, 69 C 2145 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) ..... xiii.

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX (cont.)

Complaint, Coversheet, *Allen et al. v. City of Chicago*, 92 C 4122 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1992), the Honorable Marvin E. Aspen, Judge, presiding ..... xiv.

News Article, *Chicago Daily Law Bulletin*, (October, 1995) ..... xv.

Statement of the Supplemental Index

Pro se petitioner's index in support of Petition for Writ of Mandamus seeking "back-up" tapes to show court transcripts, dockets and orders fraudulently entered to damage petitioner and others similarly situated.

The first four documents show that Lucille's fired attorney, Sosman, took money under a fraudulent judgment, without consent, while employed by opposing party, City of Chicago. (S.App. ii.-v.)

Fifth and sixth are an appearance and motion filed by former U.S. Sup. Ct. Bar member, Gordon J. Arnett, indicating his intent to request access to "back-up" tapes for Lucille the day before he died on a "repaired" (rigged?) kidney dialysis machine where five others mysteriously died a few months prior. (S.App.v.,vi.) The affidavit (eighth) serves to show attorney Arnett is dead where the well-known attorney's death received little or no press. (App. viii.) Documents eleven and twelve show prior attempts by G. Arnett to secure tapes for other *Shakman* litigants prior to his death. (S.App. xi.,xii)

Seven is a motion by Lucilee demanding court tapes to show fraud which was filed several times in 1989 and in 1994 by Lucille. In nine, Lucille not listed Pro se on transcripts taken January 18, 1990, (labeled January 11, 1990) months after Sosman was removed by court order Nov. 17, 1989. (S.App.ix.)

Ten is judge Nordberg giving "blanket approval" to City of Chicago's reasons to deny Lucille's Motion to Reconsider. (S.App.

x.) Judge Nordberg offered no reason to indicate why Lucille's claims of fraud have no merit. Thirteen, Fourteen and Fifteen offer proof of efforts to control City of Chicago liability claims by federal judgeships to ex-City of Chicago corporation counsel. (S.App. xiii, xiv., xv)

CIVIL DOCKET CONTINUATION SHEET

Plaintiff Defendant

Docket No. 85 C 5956

LUCILLE, John, et al CITY OF CHICAGO, et al

DATE	NR.	PROCEEDINGS
11/14/89	76	Filed 11/013/89:Plaintiff John Lucille's notice of filing;
FMP		Motion for new counsel or (Pro Se); (Attachments).
11/17/89	77	Minute Order of 11/16/89:Filed defendants' motion for ruling pursuant to Local Rule 12(p). Court grants Steven H. Sosman's oral motion to withdraw as counsel for plaintiff John Lucille. Court grants John Lucille leave to proceed to trial pro se. Court requires response to pending motions by November 24, 1989, 1989 and completed final pretrial order by November 27, 1989. All parties must be present at pre-trial conference. Any plaintiff failing to appear on November 30, 1989 will be dismissed for want of prosecution. Copy of this order is being mailed to John Lucille, 2741 W. Warren Blvd. Chicago 60612. Trial briefs may be filed by December 8, 1989. Pretrial conference set for Nov. 30, 1989 at 4:30 p.m. Nordberg, J. Mailed notice 11/17/89.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN LUCILLE, ORVILLE JONES and JAMES WHITE, Plaintiffs,	) Docket No.85C5956
v.	) Chicago, Illinois
	) December 4, 1989
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al., Defendants,	) 5:00 o'clock p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN A. NORDBERG

APPEARANCES:
For the Plaintiffs
Jones and White:
STEVEN H. SOSMAN & ASSOCIATES, by:
MR. STEVEN SOSMAN
(188 West Randolph Street
Suite 1200 Chicago, Illinois 60601)
For the Plaintiff
Lucille: MR. JOHN LUCILLE, pro se

For the Defendant:
MS. NANCY VAN ALLEN
MS. MARY SMITH
Assistant Corporation Counsel
(180 North LaSalle Street
Suite 1408
Chicago, Illinois 60601):

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN LUCILLE, ORVILLE JONES and JAMES WHITE, Plaintiffs,	)
v.	) No. 85 C 5956
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al., Defendants,	)

FINAL JUDGMENT ORDER

This cause comes to be heard for the entry of Judgment and Final Settlement in the above cause with all parties given notice and the Court fully advised in the premises;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. That as the Plaintiff John Lucille has resolved his dispute with the Defendants, the City of Chicago, Charles Pounian, Eugene Barnes, William Sommerford and Lester Dickinson by way of Settlement Agreement, judgment is hereby entered in favor of the Plaintiff John Lucille and against the City of Chicago in the total of TWENTY ONE THOUSAND AND 00/100 DOLLARS($21,000.00) as damages and not as back pay, and inclusive of all costs and attorneys' fees.

tw.

2. That the complaint is hereby dismissed against defendants Pounian, Barnes, Sommerford and Dickinson, with prejudice and that the judgment is to be paid by the City of Chicago.

3. That this Judgment Order is a Final Order, and is entered in accordance with the Settlement Agreement which has been signed by all parties or the authorized representatives and filed with the Court.

4. That the City's obligations pursuant to this Final order shall be completed within sixty days of the receipt by the Defendants' counsel of a copy of the entry of the Judgment.

5. That judgment is entered against the City of Chicago and in favor of attorney Steven H. Sosman in the total amount of FOUR THOUSAND AND 00/100 ($4,000.00).

6. That on or before January 16, 1990, or upon receipt by defendants' counsel of a copy of this Judgment Order, whichever occurs last, John Lucille shall be further

afforded career service upon reinstatement to that position.

Dated: Jan. 18, 1990

Honorable Judge Nordberg

Steven H. Sosman
Attorney for John Lucille
7 South Dearborn
Suite 1318
Chicago, Illinois 60603
641-3755

ir.r.

CIVIL DOCKET CONTINUATION SHEET

Plaintiff Defendant

Docket No. 85 C 5956

LUCILLE, John, et al CITY OF CHICAGO, et al

DATE	NR.	PROCEEDINGS
01/22/90	91	Minute order of 01/18/90:Judgment is entered as follows: Court accepts settlement agreement dismissing all claims against defendants Pounian, Barnes, Sommerford, and Dickinson with prejudice and that the judgment is to be paid by the City of Chicago. Judgment is entered in favor of plaintiff John Lucille and against City of Chicago in the amount of $21,000.00 which includes all costs and attorneys' fees. Status hearing held. (For further detail see order attached to the original minute order form.) Nordberg, J. Mailed notice 01/22/90.
	92	Entered 01/18/90: Final judgment order.
...		
08/10/93	98	Filed 08/10/93: Appearance of Gordon James Arnett for plaintiff John Lucille.

R E C E I V E D
SEP 08 1993
H. STUART CUNNINGHAM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN LUCILLE, et al., Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	No. 85 C 5956
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al., Defendants,	)	JUDGE NORDBERG

PLAINTIFF'S PRELIMINARY REPLY
TO PETITION TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT

This is a preliminary reply, because an adequate Reply cannot be filed unless and until Plaintiff has been allowed to listen to and/or transcribe portions of the electronic recorder TAPE of the hearing in the judge's chambers which ultimately led to the Settlement Agreement in this case. In Defendant City's Reply, no reference is made to any caselaw, primarily because there never has been any case, except for the one for plaintiff's friend and co-worker in the Sewer Department -- no case which was not either terminated at the Summary Judgment stage or by settlement agreement. Therefore, no legal research is required of plaintiff for his Reply Memo,

BL

The purpose of a Reply Memorandum is to reply to any issues or points raised in the Response. Here, Defendant City of Chicago contends--

"plaintiff shall be afforded seniority ... to July 16, 1980 and shall be afforded career service status" "and the City specifically disclaimed... any unlawful conduct against plaintiff (p.4)."

"In late 1992... the...General Assembly... provided for an Early Retirement Incentive Program..." "This Court can take judicial notice that the Fund... is a legal entity separate and distinct from the City of Chicago.

Defendant raises a crucial factual dispute in footnote #2, page 5. She argues that she "had no knowledge or information ... that plaintiff withdrew approximately $48,000 from the Fund subsequent to his" [rest of footnote missing, so we can't tell what else Attorney Mary L. Smith is trying to state.]

Then, when their memo continues with a reference to what Mr. Lucille may have understood during negotiations as to the "right to elect early retirement" requires the parties and their attorneys to listen to the electronic TAPE made by the court reporter. This is the only sure and binding way to learn what was actually discussed.

Plaintiff plans to file tomorrow (9/9/93) a Motion to Listen to Tape, after which he will seek leave to file a Supplemental Reply Memorandum.

Gordon James Arnett

GORDON JAMES ARNETT
Attorney for Plaintiff
5865 N. Lincoln Ave., #112
Chicago 60659
334-0400

bi.r.

RECEIVED
NOV 24 1989
H. STUART CUNNINGHAM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

John Lucille, et. al., Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	No. 85 C 5956
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al., Defendants,	)	Judge Nordberg

PLAINTIFF NOTICE TO STRIKE
AND DISMISS - MOTION IN LIMINE

Plaintiff, by his (Pro Se) counsel John Lucille move to strike and dismiss all Motions-in-Limine. ...

To strike motion in Limine Plaintiff states as follows: ...

84 C 9978 - II Plaintiff need order From Court to Hear Voice Tape From Wzorek Trial.

RECEIVED
SEP 6 1994
H. STUART CUNNINGHAM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

RECEIVED
APR 20 1994
H. STUART CUNNINGHAM
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

mL

On June 15th and June 29, 1984 Mayor Washington fired workers in violation of the Shakman Decree. The 27th Ward was half of the firing. There are 50 wards, how can one ward be half of the firing? Six out of seven supervisors were from the 27th ward. Tony of the 47th ward went back to work, that means 6 out of 6 were from the 27th ward. When workers filed law suits the city knew it was wrong. The Corporation Counsel took over and the big cover-up started. We checked with counsels in other placed and they said the people who changed the trial transcripts had to be crazy. They went to far when they took some of my testimony out, they forgot who I am. My testimony was over half Shakman. They will not get away with it. I have copies of everything. I pray for you to have the wisdom of King Solomon.

Dated at Chicago Illinois this 24 day of November 1989

Respectively Submitted

_____

John Lucille
Pro SE Counsel

2741 West Warren
Chicago, Illinois
(312) 826-7264

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

	Page
Statement of the Supplemental Appendix	i.
Civil Docket Sheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) p. 7	ii.
Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) December 4, 1989, ...	iii.
Final Judgment Order, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985)	iv.
Civil Docket Sheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) p. 8	v.
Plaintiff's Preliminary Reply to Petition to Enforce Settlement Agreement, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985)	vi.
Plaintiff's Certified Affidavit re: Death of Arnett, Gordon James, of Chicago, Illinois, U.S. Supreme Court Bar Member (9/9/93)	vii.

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX (cont.)

Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) January 11, 1990, ... viii.

Minute Order of 4/27/95, *Lucille, John et al. v. City of Chicago* 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1985) the Honorable John A. Nordberg, presiding ..... ix.

Transcript of Proceedings, Coversheet, *Wzorek, Eugene v. City of Chicago* 84 C 9978 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) July 23, 1992, ... x.

Civil Docket Sheet, *Wzorek, Eugene v. City of Chicago* 84 C 9978 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) p. 15 , line 207 ..... xi.

General Order, *Shakman v. The Democratic Organization of Cook County*, 69 C 2145 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1984) ..... xii.

Complaint, Coversheet, *Allen et al. v. City of Chicago*, 92 C 4122 (N.D.Ill.E.D.1992), the Honorable Marvin E. Aspen, Judge, presiding ..... xiii.

News Article, *Chicago Daily Law Bulletin*, (October, 1995) ..... xiv.

Petitioner's Certified Affidavit

I, John Lucille, certify and declare pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1746 as follows:

1. That I am an adult, and competent to testify to the following in a court of law.
2. That I have continually requested "back-up" tapes from the lower district court and the Seventh Circuit appellate court through my own motions and through my attorneys, but have been denied the same.
3. That upon information and belief, Gordon James Arnett, my attorney, died by way of a defective kidney dialysis machine (9/9/93), the day after he made known his intention to request the tapes which would show fraud upon the court in 85 C 5956 (N.D.Ill.E.D.)
4. That numerous threats and attempts on my life have taken place for appealing the fraudulent judgments entered against me all because City of Chicago does not want to pay what it owes to hundreds of present and former employees unlawfully fired.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on Oct. 23, 1995

John Lucille PRO SE

John Lucille, Pro Se

Ill.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN LUCILLE, et al.	) No.85 C 5956
Plaintiffs,	)
v.	)Chicago, Illinois
	)January 11, 1990
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al.,	) 9:30 a.m.
Defendants,	)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - MOTION
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN A. NORDBERG

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

STEVEN H. SOSMAN & ASSOCIATES,by:
MR. STEVEN SOSMAN
(188 West Randolph Street
Suite 1200 Chicago,Illinois 60601)

For the Defendant:
MS. NANCY VAN ALLEN
Assistant Corporation Counsel
Labor Division
30 North LaSalle Street Suite 1020
Suite 1408
Chicago, Illinois 60602):

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

H. Stuart Cunningham
CLERK

Office of the Clerk

John Lucille
2741 W. Warren Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60612

Case Number 1:85-cv-05956
Title: Lucille v. Chgo, Cty of
Assigned Judge: Honorable John A. Nordberg

MINUTE ORDER of 4/27/95 by Hon. John A. Nordberg: Granting plaintiff John Lucille's motion to set a ruling date [152-1]. Plaintiff's motion to reconsider the 8/25/94 dismissal of his 4/20/94 joint petition to modify and supplemental petition for rule [141-1] is denied for the reasons set forth at length in the defendant, City of Chicago's response to plaintiff's motion to reconsider. For the same reasons, the court denies plaintiff's motion to strike the City's "response" to his motion to reconsider [145-1] date stamped 11/10/95.* Judge Nordberg's has been the presiding judge throughout this case. Plaintiff's claims have no merit. Mailed notice

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on April 28, 1995

ATTENTION: This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was generated by ICMS, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please refer to it for additional information.

*Wrong date.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

EUGENE WZOREK,	)No.84 C 9978
	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	)Chicago, Illinois
	)July 23, 1992
CITY OF CHICAGO,	)9:30 a.m.
Defendant,	)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - MOTION
BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRIAN BARNETT DUFF

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:
MR. GORDON JAMES ARNETT
5865 North Lincoln Avenue, Suite 112
Chicago, Illinois 60659

For the Defendant:
MR. TERENCE J. MORAN
Assistant Corporation Counsel
Labor Division
180 North LaSalle Street Suite 1408
Chicago, Illinois 60601:

CIVIL DOCKET CONTINUATION SHEET

Plaintiff Defendant

Docket No. 84 C 9978

WZOREK, Eugene CITY OF CHICAGO

DATE	NR.	PROCEEDINGS
92	207	Minute order of 07/23/92: Plaintiff's motion to produce the court reporter's electronic recording tapes is denied. Duff, J. Mailed notice.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

In the Matter of	)	
Michael L. Shakman and	)	
Paul M. Lurie, et al.	)	
v.	)	Civil Action
	)	No.69 C 2145
The Democratic Organization	)	
of Cook County, et al.,	)	

GENERAL ORDER

It appearing that:---
(a) on 16 May 1983 the Executive Committee entered an order in the above captioned cause...
(b) ...
(c) ...
(d) the matter of the assigment of the petitions arising out of 69 C 2145 was discussed by the Court at its meeting on 15 November 1984, therefore

By direction of the full Court met in executive session on Thursday, 15 November 1984,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED ...

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That any petitions alleging violations of or to enforce provisions of the judgments and decrees entered in 69 C 2145 reassigned to the initial calendar of Judge Rovner as being related to 69 C 2145 be reassigned by lot according to the rules, provided that no such petition shall be assigned to the calendar of the Honorable Marvin E. Aspen.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED ....

ENTER:

FOR THE COURT

Frank McGarr
Chief Judge

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 19th day of November 1984.

IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

HENRY ALLEN, et al)
)
v.) 92C4122
)
CITY OF CHICAGO, et al.)

JUDGE ASPEN
MAGISTRATE JUDGE LEFKOW

COMPLAINT

7 in contention for seat on federal bench

By JOHN FLYNN ROONEY
Law Bulletin staff writer

Illinois' two U.S. senators have received the names of seven finalists for a district court vacancy in Chicago from the merit commission appointed by the senators. The finalists include ... Chicago's corporation counsel and ...two lawyers in private practice... The finalists are said to be: ...Susan S. Sher, who heads the City of Chicago's Law Department; ... and Joseph M. Gagliardo, a partner at Laner, Muchin, ... Gagliardo, 42, a former first deputy Chicago corporation counsel, said Wednesday he was thrilled about his selection as a finalist. ... Sher has served as corporation counsel since April 1993, and as first assistant corporation counsel from May 1989 until her elevation. The 47-year-old also worked as an associate and partner at Mayer, Brown & Platt, and as an associate general counsel at the University of Chicago four years before joining the corporation counsel's office.